DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 493 CS 504 600

AUTHOR	Brill, Bettye Wright
TITLE	The United Church of Christ: Defending Access to Broadcasting.
INSTITUTION	Freedom of Information Center, Columbia, Mo.
REPORT NO	FOI-491
PUB DATE	Apr 84
NOTE	8p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Freedom of Information Center, Box 858, Columbia, MO 65205 (1-24 copies, $1.00 each).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Broadcast Industry; *Civil Rights; *Commercial Television; *Federal Regulation; Government Role; Racial Discrimination; Radio; Religious Discrimination; *Religious Organizations; Telecommunications
IDENTIFIERS	Access Control; *Broadcast Licensing; Federal Communications Commission; *United Church of Christ

ABSTRACT

The 20-year conflict of the United Church of Christ (UCC) with the broadcast industry concerning discrimination is described in this report, which first details in part how UCC's challenge to the license renewal of station WLBT-TV in Jackson, Mississippi, established important legal precedents. It then describes UCC's groundbreaking work in investigating discriminatory hiring practices of broadcast stations, and reviews the reported reticence of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) in taking decisive action to stop abuses. Other areas of relevance detailed in the report are the UCC's involvement in challenging the FCC's stance on deregulation of airwaves as public property, and the regulation of cable broadcasts. (CRH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED246493

SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI AT COLUMBIA
APRIL 1984

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GHANTED BY

Paul Fisher

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THE UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST: DEFENDING ACCESS TO BROADCASTING

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION CENTER REPORT NO. 491

This report was written by Bettye Wright Brill, a Master's candidate at the University of Missouri School of Journalism.

The Office of Communication, United Church of Christ, has spent more than 20 years skirmishing with the broadcast industry to combat discrimination. Under the directorship of the Rev. Everett Parker, the office in 1964 unleashed an era of citizens' reform in radio and TV when it pioneered the first citizens' challenge to a television station's license renewal. The weapon it wielded so effectively was government regulation. Its adversary was racial discrimination in broadcast. The office has continued its efforts on behalf of minorities and women in that industry to this day.

Parker's retirement last August, however, has coincided with intense FCC and congressional pressure to deregulate the broadcast industry. Such action could wrest the office's weapon from its hands. Consequently, 1984 finds the office still resolutely championing the rights of the public — but from the defensive position of having to protect regulation, rather than using that regulation in the United Church of Christ's historical offensive against discrimination. Strategies for the future, should the battle be lost, have yet to be determined.

The accomplishments of the UCC Office of Communication (see side bar) read like a list of historical milestones in broadcast-minority relations. And the church's involvement with minority rights reaches even farther into the past, as far as the abolitionist activities of one of its precursors, the Congrational Christian Church. In telephone conversations last November, Parker outlined the evolution of the modern church, a merger of the Evangelical and Reformed Church with the Congregational Christian Churches, which continues to "heed biblical directives to work on the side of the poor, the dispossessed, the handicapped, the ill." Realizing the impact of electronic communications, Parker says the UCC has sought, through its Office of Communication, to use the industry "not to promote the denomination, but to aid the voiceless."

In reviewing his crusade to aid the voiceless, Parker declines to say which of the office's endeavors has been of greatest import. "The challenges were important, but so was getting equal opportunity established," he says. "I can't say what I think is the most important."

The case most often cited, however, as well as the one that may well have laid the groundwork for the others, was the UCC's challenge to the license renewal of station WLBT-TV in Jackson, Miss. Not only did that challenge result in revoking the station's license because of racially discriminatory practices, but it also established for the first time the public's right to intervene in FCC hearings. Before, only those with an economic stake in the proceedings — rival broadcasters, representatives of the government or those claiming "electrical interference" — were granted standing to intervene.[1] Says Parker now, "We showed them we had an economic interest, all right. We own the television sets."

Parker and the UCC already had been heavily involved with the civil rights movement when complaints were running high against station WLBT-TV.

WLBT was then the strongest station in the South and among the most racially biased.

"Sorry, cable trouble," the station announced during a 1955 appearance by Thurgood Marshall, then-general coun-

Summary:

For two decades, the United Church of Christ has worked to assure nondiscriminatory public access to the broadcast industry. The weapon of access the UCC has wielded so effectively is government regulation. But recent FCC and congressional pressure to deregulate broadcasting could wrest away that weapon.

CS 504 600

sel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The station owners later denied rebuttal by blacks to the telecast, "Little Rock Crisis," which presented white, elected Mississippi officials espousing segregationist viewpoints. WLBT's owners "did not consider the matters being presented as being controversial, but a report from our duly elected officials to the people of Mississippi."[2]

Despite continued citizens' complaints (more than 45 percent of the Jackson population was black), the station continued its abuses. When James Meredith enrolled at Ole Miss in 1962, the station carried editorials opposing his entry into the all-white school. The owners maintained that the Fairness Doctrine did not apply to the issue, as they were not dealing with "racial integration as such," but rather with "states' rights" in a "constitutional crisis."[3]

Having already devised monitoring methods acceptable to FCC, Parker says the Office of Communication had been actively looking around the South for a station to challenge. "We knew that if broadcasting could be turned around, the civil rights movement would be viable." WLBT won the questionable honor.

For a week, white volunteers met secretly in the home of one of Jackson's white families. "We allowed no blacks, because I didn't want the commission saying it was just a bunch of blacks trying to make a case for themselves," Parker remembers. "And I didn't allow them to be introduced. That way, when the examiner tried to get their names public so the people of Jackson could harass them, I could say I didn't know them."

The people of Jackson, however, did discover the family who harbored the volunteers. Neighbors remembered seeing televisions being brought in and all the people coming in and out during the week of monitoring. "They ran that family out of town," Parker recalls. "That's the kind of place Jackson was."

But running the family out of town couldn't stop the ball put into motion by Parker and his workers. Although the FCC refused to revoke the station's license, the United Church of Christ entered a court appeal. Responding to that appeal, then-Circuit Court Judge Warren Burger ruled that citizens had standing before the FCC, the grounds on which the commission had refused the petition. Again, the FCC refused to revoke the station's license. On that second refusal, Judge Burger ordered the license "vacated forthwith."[4]

Looking back, Parker clearly disdains the role the FCC has played in his dealings with it. "We never got anywhere with the FCC," he states. "It was always the courts that backed us up...The law is there to protect the public, but the government doesn't do a thing. You have to do it yourself. You have to watch your rights constantly."

Parker accedes to such watchfulness the failure of what he sees as FCC chairman Mark Fowler's attempt in 1981 to railroad the withdrawal of Equal Employment Opportunity rules in broadcasting.

> Two years ago, Fowler tried to put withdrawal of EEO rules on the commission's agenda at the last possible minute, right before the Christmas break. We got wind of it and got everyone on the phones and had him back on the ropes by the next Friday.

Thus far, the FCC still is upholding its broadcast EEO rules. The very existence of equal employment rules in broadcasting is a result of the efforts of the Office of Communication. After establishing standing for citizens before the FCC in 1966, the office petitioned the commission in 1968 to establish the rules in order to bring stations into compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The petition itself was a precedent. It was the first time the FCC had ever accepted a petition from a public group on its rule-making procedures.[5]

That done, Parker remembers awaiting the results of the annual surveys that were to be conducted. The FCC issued none. "So, we asked if we could analyze the data ourselves," he says. Once the FCC had agreed, Parker sent workers to pick up the reports filed by the broadcasters. "They were stuck in a drawer," he says. "The envelopes hadn't even been opened."

Without the aid of computers, Parker and his workers conducted the first analysis of EEO data gathered by the FCC and continued to do so for three more years until the commission took over.

The 1971 study showed that white, male employees dominated the country's television stations, with women and minorities usually excluded from decision-making positions. Between 1971 and 1974, total full-time employment of minority group members increased from 8 percent to 12 percent, and full-time employment of women increased from 22 percent to 24 percent. Employment of minority group members in decision-making positions increased from 6 percent to 9 percent between 1971 and 1974, and the employment of women in these upper-level jobs increased from 6 percent to 11 percent during the same period. However, it is not clear whether this improvement is entirely the result of hiring or advancing employees to new jobs or whether some stations merely changed people's titles while keeping them in the same jobs.[5]

Once the FCC took over the task, Parker says, "It took them eight to nine months to do what we did in two or three weeks." He adds that the FCC now delays releasing the results for so long that the data is essentially worthless in terms of filing effective complaints.

"They didn't analyze the data at all for cable," he continues. "We've turned out the only analysis of cable."

That was part of the Office of Communication's two-year "EEO Project in Broadcasting and Cable." Under that program, the office formulated questionnaires to evaluate hiring practices of stations in their areas. The project's accompanying booklet, **Advancing Equal Employment Opportunities in Broadcasting and Cable**, included not just advice on how to approach the stations and to use the records, but also copies of the actual FCC forms volunteers were to photocopy as part of the review process. The FCC is meticulous about requiring the expected forms when citi-

zens complain.
In the course of that two-year program, the Office of Communication worked to inform church and community leaders about equal employment rules and enforcement in broadcasting and cable. More than 100 volunteers in 23 states used the materials to evaluate employment status for women and minorities in cable during 1980-81.

> The study, released in November 1982, revealed that white males continue to dominate the decision-making jobs in the industry. They hold 57 percent of all positions and 85 percent of the high-level posts.[7]

As well as analyzing data and conducting surveys and workshops, the Office of Communication has turned out a number of publications designed to guide citizens through the "watchdog" process over the years. Their titles bespeak their thrust:

- **In Defense of Fairness**
- **Racial Justice in Broadcasting**
- **How to Protect Citizen Rights in Television and Radio**
- **Parties in Interest**
- **Keeping Your Eye On Television**
- **A Lawyer's Sourcebook: Representing the Audience in Broadcast Proceedings**
- **Cable Television: A Guide To Citizen Action**
- **A Short Course in Cable**

All of the publications, the office's Associate Director Dr. Janice Engsberg says, are out of print. Single copies of some, such as **Parties In Interest** and the ones on cable, still are available. **A Short Course in Cable** may be reprinted when those copies are gone. Sometimes she photocopies booklets, or parts of them, for those who request them. She explains:

> Regulations have been changing so rapidly that the booklets become outdated. As part of the Telecommunications Consumer Coalition, we print periodic informational mailings to keep the public informed about current and upcoming topics of concern.

Those outdated publications are symbolic of, and the rapidly changing regulations largely responsible for, a shift in the office's impetus.
Its directives haven't changed, but its battle stance has. Engsberg says, "It's the nature of the political situation. In the early Sixties, through the Seventies, we were still very much on the offensive." In working hand-in-hand with citizens' groups, the office was "initiating actions, was helping citizens negotiate agreements with stations and, in many ways, calling the shots."
Then-Rep. Lionel Van Deerlin, D-Calif., framed what Engsberg calls "the first omnibus bill" to rewrite the Communications Act of 1934. "It treated every section of the act," including the Fairness Doctrine. "Citizens' groups had to marshall forces as never before," she explains.
Aware that the impending legislation was forthcoming for nearly two years before it was introduced, the Office of Communication worked to raise the opposition.
By the time the bill was introduced, the office had spearheaded the formation of the Telecommunications Consumer Coalition. Engsberg calls the group more an information clearinghouse than an action-oriented coalition in the usual sense of the word. The office monitors FCC and congressional activities concerning telecommunications and relays the updated information — what bills, policies, etc., are being considered, when votes will occur, who to call or write — to its 177 participants.
Among its members are groups such as Action for Children's Television, Black Citizens for Fair Media, National Organization for Women and numerous church groups and other activist groups. It was with the help of the Telecommunications Consumer Coalition members that Parker successfully fended off Mark Fowler's attempt to withdraw the industry's EEO rules in 1981.
The office countered Van Deerlin's Communications Act of 1978 by calling in two volunteers for every member on the House subcommittee originating the bill, "teaching them to participate on the local level — even to the extent of role playing," Engsberg says.
When Van Deerlin conducted his first round of field meetings around the country, Engsberg says the training generated "a lot of local participation." The House then decided to hold the next round of hearings in Washington, despite protests from the Office of Communication. "So we conducted our own...in places where members of the subcommittee were from...and invited the House members to meet with the local people."
Van Deerlin's bill eventually fell by the wayside, opposed by the public interest groups — and the industry. Although broadcasters met the bill with much excitement, they soon got cold feet at the thought of paying the substantial spectrum fees that would free them from regulation. As **Broadcasting** magazine reported at the time,

> The irrationality of the broadcast schedule would itself be reason enough to oppose the fee proposition, quite apart from the basic premise, which is questionable, that spectrum users ought to pay for a physical resource that is neither maintained by the government nor depleted with use.[8]

Deregulation had become the catchword, however, and the stampede to deregulate that followed has put the Office of Communication on the defensive — defending not necessarily itself, but the principles that had allowed it to operate so effectively during the previous two decades. Everett Parker says right up front that regulation is the reason the office always has sought to give a voice to the voiceless through broadcast rather than print.
Parker, by the way, minimizes the thought of being in a de-

fensive position. "We're always on the defensive," he says. "We're always reacting to the industry. We had to win the right to challenge the broadcasters. Our legal right is as strong as it ever was."

One aspect of that legal right is the foundation on which broadcast regulation is based — that the airwaves, of which there are a limited number, belong to the public, and that broadcasters, who use the airwaves free of charge, are in turn "trustees for the public." This concept, bolstered by the Fairness Doctrine, which dictates that broadcasters must allow contrasting views to controversial issues that have been aired, constitutes regulation unheard of in the print media.

Broadcasters long have considered regulation an abridgement of their First Amendment rights. That is one argument being advanced by proponents of deregulation.

Eliminating regulation, including the Fairness Doctrine, "would promote the public interest by vindicating a host of First Amendment values and norms," FCC General Counsel Bruce E. Fein said last August. He said that arguments used to justify those regulations, such as the fear that the public could be swayed and misled by broadcasters

> are flawed. The idea that it's up to the government to protect us from free speech is contrary to the spirit of the First Amendment. Even when broadcasters offer biased programming, audience exposure to fallacious reasoning or falsehood aids the understanding and defense of truth.[9]

Parker, however, sees no conflict between regulation and the First Amendment. "The First Amendment," he says, "is a guarantee for the **people**, not for broadcasters or publishers. It's a guarantee for the people to have access, to be heard."

In Red Lion Broadcasting v. the FCC, the Supreme Court has agreed:

> Because of the scarcity of radio frequencies (the term includes all airwaves), the government is permitted to put restraints on licensees in favor of others whose views should be expressed on this unique medium. But the people as a whole retain their interest in free speech by radio and their collective right to have the medium function consistently with the ends and purposes of the First Amendment. It is the right of the viewers and listeners, not the right of the broadcasters, which is paramount. It is the purpose of the First Amendment to preserve an uninhibited marketplace of ideas in which truth will ultimately prevail, rather than to countenance monopolization of the market, whether it be by the government itself or a private licensee.[10]

Even the scarcity argument is being challenged, however. That challenge also is being advanced in favor of current deregulatory moves. This is an excerpt from a report by the Commerce Department's National Telecommunications and Information Administration:

> If spectrum scarcity ever existed, it certainly does not today...Today's technology has so expanded the number of outlets and hence the opportunities for a number of ways to get one's ideas, thoughts and beliefs across that no formalized distinctions based only on the method or means used to communicate can equitably or constitutionally be imposed.[11]

Others dispute the argument. These "new" technologies penetrate a small percentage of American homes: video recorders, which are used primarily to view rented or purchased prerecorded movies and non-news entertainment, reach only about 4 percent, and satellite systems reach even fewer than that.

As the most viable alternative to broadcasting, cable theoretically can reach half of all households, but only 34 percent of that number now does. There are many communities that never will be able to be wired profitably. And although new coaxial cables can carry up to 108 channels, most existing ones have a capacity for only six to 12.

Other "new" technologies in broadcasting, such as MDS (multi-point distribution service) reach only about 1 percent of all households. LPTV (low-power television), which would make use of the 4,000 or so existing relay stations to broadcast locally originated programs on unused channels, reaches fewer than half of 1 percent of American households. Spectrum scarcity, then, is eased by the new technologies, but not erased by them.[12]

In its comments to the FCC on its proposed deregulation of television, the Office of Communication quoted Rep. Timothy Wirth, D-Colo., on the subject:

> Only about 30 percent of the nation's homes have cable; most low power television licenses have not yet been granted; and only about 2 percent of the United States receives STV (subscription TV) or MDS service.

Wirth is chairman of the House Committee on Telecommunications, Consumer Protection and Finance.

The First Amendment and scarcity arguments, accompanied by the quote from the Office of Communication's 33-page comment to the FCC, are a simplistic synopsis of the office's situation today. The opposing arguments represent the balancing act the office finds itself in, and the FCC comments are its attempt to regain its footing. The barrage of legislation that followed Van Deerlin's bill, as well as the FCC's own attempts to deregulate broadcasting, has prompted the office to turn its energies to responding to

each new proposal rather than initiating its own actions.
For instance, Congress essentially considered only one deregulation bill in 1978 and in 1979: Van Deerlin's "Communications Act of 1978" and its revisionin 1979. When passing an omnibus bill didn't work, Engsberg says, Congress started dealing with deregulation in bits and pieces — in many bills and in many ways.
The Office of Communication, in addition to following and commenting on proposed FCC regulations (and deregulations), also tracks legislation and informs participants in the Telecommunications Consumer Coalition about the bills, urging them to contact the appropriate representatives or senators.
At least six bills were considered in 1980, dealing separately with licensing, frequency allocation, radio deregulation, Equal Time, the Fairness Doctrine, etc. Congress considered at least 16 such bills in 1981, with some being tucked into budget legislation. An incomplete survey of 1982 reveals no fewer than six separate bills, and in the first six months of 1983, no fewer than eight were considered.[13]
Scattering legislation throughout both houses of Congress diffuses the efforts of public interest groups, Engsberg says. It becomes increasingly difficult for them to keep up with the issues. "We're expected to respond to all of them," she says of the bills, "but hardly have the resources to do so. And then, the FCC launches hearings, and we have to keep up with those."
Engsberg says that before the Reagan administration,

> people at the FCC Consumer Assistance Office knew us, knew our concerns and would automatically send us notices, cue us on issues. Now, it's like pulling teeth to get information. I have to call up for every piece of information they used to send automatically.

Everett Parker says, "the Reagan administration is trying to dismantle the U.S. government."
Reagan's FCC Chairman Mark Fowler has made no bones about wanting to dismantle telecommunications regulations. When he took office in May 1981, Fowler made it clear that "not a single rule or policy is safe. Everyone will be examined in the hard, cold light of current realities. Unless it survives the scrutiny, the commission will get rid of it."[14]
And as the FCC scrutinizes each rule, the Office of Communication responds, Engsberg says. When the United Church of Christ appealed the FCC's deregulation of radio, that appeal emerged from information gathered initially for the FCC comments. Although the court upheld the FCC, it also stated that the commission should reconsider eliminating program logs. "Citizen groups in the past," noted the court, "have found the program logs to be essential to obtain the concrete information necessary to demonstrate a radio station's inadequate performance in a petition to deny..."[15]
So, on Nov. 21, 1983, the office responded with 33 pages of comments to the FCC's proposals to deregulate television.
One of the criticisms aimed at the commission in the comments was that

> the present proceeding has been instituted in the midst of congressional action in broadcasting (S.55 and H.R. 2370 and 2382). The major revisions now under consideration should be stayed until Congress has concluded its legislative revisions (MM Docket 83-760).

Says Engsberg, "We forsee a court challenge" if the FCC adopts the proposal.
Thus, as Engsberg explains, the Office of Communication is playing in three arenas now. "We have to play in Congress to get the best legislation possible passed: We can't ignore the FCC, which is setting new policies. Our comments there form the basis for our case if we have to haul them into the courts.
"Sometimes," she adds, "it seems as though the Senate, the House and the FCC are having a footrace to see who can deregulate first."
The Office of Communication's new director, Dr. Beverly Chain, is not hopeful about the outcome of the race. "With telephones and radio already deregulated and this cable bill likely to pass pretty much as written, I have to admit I am pessimistic," she states. "We are facing a whole new day. Without some kind of regulatory backup, citizens' groups won't have a basis on which to force broadcasters to deal fairly with the rights of minorities and women."
Although she doesn't see the complete elimination of Equal Time and the Fairness Doctrine, she does think the other deregulation will weaken them into being ineffective.
Even with the legislation and rule changes still just a possibility, she notes that stations are not running many of the office's public service announcements. "They say, 'We're not giving PSAs to religious groups...We're running fewer numbers of PSAs...We don't have enough spots for any more PSAs.' They simply don't feel their licenses will be examined on that basis any longer."
Chain calls Everett Parker's era of reform, from the early 1960s throughout the 1970s, a unique time for citizens' action.

> The public had never thought it had a voice before. Parker convinced the courts and the citizens' groups that, indeed, the airwaves did belong to the public. That opened entirely new channels for action that had not been available before. We've ridden the crest of that wave. We are losing the rules that would have made continuation in the same vein possible.

Chain says her newness in her position has not allowed her to formulate concrete strategies for the future. She knows, however, that "we will be seeking a new advocacy as innovative as that of Parker's." Some areas she is investigating, although she concedes she may well have different opinions

by next year are:

> grass roots training of the public, to get people involved at the local level; the public working directly with local stations, in a cooperative, not adversarial relationship; monitoring the stations' performance, if necessary, and pointing out problems while suggesting creative solutions; using whatever rights they have left to affect change; as a last resort: boycotts, conspicuously absent from the office's reform methods of the past; boycotts of local advertisers; stockholder action against companies by their shareholders.

On a somewhat more positive note, Chain says she hopes to broaden the office's Telecommunications Career Recruitment for the cable industry. She says the current program, funded by Westinghouse Cable, has been "extremely successful." The Office of Communication sets up local citizens' review boards to interview applicants and screen minorities for various positions at a local cable station, usually in the areas of management, installers and salespeople. The office also maintains a staff person who interviews and evaluates applicants, meeting with the cable companies to say, "Here's a good pool of people — call us if you have an opening."

"Westinghouse," Chain says, "has been extremely cooperative," and she hopes other cable companies may provide similar funding, or pay small placement fees, for similar services.

Chain also sees a new issue of concern looming in the future for her organization: the growing impact of computerization and interactive television and their potential for invasion of privacy.

Her colleague, Associate Director Engsberg, warns of the future, "Do not sound the death knell for public interest groups...One of this office's greatest strengths has always been its persistence over time."

Everett Parker says, "We have to keep at it. The industries never give up. The people of the United States will keep fighting. Enough of them will."

Against all the odds, the Office of Communication, United Church of Christ, probably will lead the way.

UCC Lists Two Decades of Achievements

In March 1983, the Office of Communication announced the Rev. Everett Parker's coming retirement. It included with its announcement the following list of achievements:

- 1964—**Public Standing in License Renewals.** The Office of Communication files a petition with the Federal Communications Commission to deny renewal of the license of WLBT-TV in Jackson, Miss., alleging that the station's programming practices are racially discriminatory. This represents the first action ever instituted before the FCC by a church or other public interest group acting as a disinterested champion of a large segment of the population that has been deprived of its rights. The case later makes legal history when the courts rule that viewers and listeners in the community have standing before the FCC to participate in license procedures.
- 1968—**Broadcast EEO Rules.** The FCC grants a petition filed by the Office of Communication, United Church Board for Homeland Ministries and Commission for Racial Justice, that calls on the FCC to establish equal employment rules to bring broadcasting stations into compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964.
- 1968—**Citizen-Station Agreements.** With a pending petition to deny renewal of the license of KTAL-TV in Texarkana, Texas, the Office of Communication and community groups win an out-of-court settlement promising increased community-oriented programming. As a result, precedent is set for citizens' groups and station management to negotiate formal agreements.
- 1969—**Ghetto Workshops.** The Office of Communication conducts a series of workshops in five cities to teach the poor how to write speeches, appear before public bodies, get material in newspapers and on radio and TV, do newsletters and use the telephone more effectively.
- 1971—**Broadcast EEO Analysis.** The office publishes the first analysis of broadcast employment data collected under EEO rules.
- 1972—**Community Group Reimbursements.** Ruling on an appeal brought by the Office of Communication, the D.C. Court of Appeals reverses an FCC decision in the KTAL case and holds that the FCC should permit broadcasters to reimburse public groups for their expenses when they settle petitions to deny license renewals by agreements aimed at better broadcast service in the public interest.
- 1974—**Check Your Local Stations.** The Office of Communication holds workshops throughout the country designed to teach the public how to monitor local broadcasters to assure they are serving the community as required by the Communications Act of 1934.

✓ 1978—**Telecommunications Consumer Coalition.** The Office of Communication helps pull together the first broadly based network of churches, minority and civil rights groups, unions, community groups and consumer organizations to exchange information about new developments in communication policy issues that affect all consumers.

✓ 1979—**VHF Drop-Ins.** The FCC adopts a petition of the Office of Communication that asks the commission to open spaces in the very high frequency television portion of the electronic spectrum covering channels 2-13. The office continues to press for its initial recommendation that the new VHF stations be licensed to minority owners or as public stations.

✓ 1981—**Cable Workshops.** The Office of Communication develops a curriculum and workshop series to train the public on how to make the best use of cable.

✓ 1982—**Impact on AT&T Agreement.** A coalition of churches led by the Office of Communication is granted intervenor status in the antitrust settlement between the American Telephone and Telegraph Company and the U.S. Department of Justice.

✓ 1982—**Telecommunications Career Recruitment.** The Office of Communication establishes the first national community-based program to facilitate minority employment in cable systems.

FOOTNOTES

1. Norman Lobentz, "Everett Parker's broadcasting crusade, **Columbia Journalism Review**, Fall, 1969, page 31.
2. Eloise Orr, "Challenging to TV License Renewals," **FOI Center Report #253**, Dec. 1970, page 2.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Lobentz, "Everett Parker's broadcasting crusade," page 35.
6. Office of Communication of the United Church of Christ, **Parties in Interest**, 1974, page 13.
7. "Report of the Office of Communication to the Fourteenth General Synod," United Church of Christ, pages 6 and 7.
8. "Fie on Fees," **Broadcasting**, July 31, 1978, page 66.
9. "First Amendment Parity Urged for Broadcast Media," **Media Law Reporter**, July 5, 1983, inside front and back covers.
10. Red Lion Broadcasting vs. the FCC, 895 U.S. 367, U.S. 367, U.S. (1969).
11. "ABA Broadcasting Panel Debates Trustee Concept," **Media Law Reporter**, August 9, 1983, inside and outside back cover.
12. Mark Granetz, "Fowler's Video Games," **The New Republic**, May 2, 1983, page 16.
13. **Digest of Public and General Bills and Resolutions**, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983.
14. "Mark Fowler's emancipation proclamation for radio TV," Broadcasting, June 15, 1981, page 27.
15. "Radio dereg gets high sigh from Court of Appeals," Broadcasting, May 16, 1983, page 34.

Additional copies of this report, and other Freedom of Information Center reports, may be obtained by writing the Center at Box 858, Columbia, Missouri 65205. There is a $1 charge for each single copy, 90 cents each for 25 or more copies, $60 per 100 copies, and $50 per 100 on orders of 300 or more copies.